

dh



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/965,428

09/27/2001

John E. Jones

47171-00298

3631

30223 7590 06/14/2006

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C.  
225 WEST WASHINGTON  
SUITE 2600  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

BHATNAGAR, ANAND P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,428

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Anand Bhatnagar

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 165-174, 189-193, 207-212, 215-225, 238-240, 255-258, 261-264, 325, and 326 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 165-167, 170-172, 174, 219-225, 325, and 326 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 168,169,173,189-193,207-212,215-218,238-240,255-258 and 261-264.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 03/03/06 has been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant has canceled claims 1-164, 175-188, 194-206, 213, 214, 226-237, 241-254, 259, 260, and 265-324. Claims 168, 169, 173, 189-193, 207-212, 215-218, 238-240, 255-258, and 261-264 have been withdrawn. Currently, claims 165-174, 189-193, 207-212, 215-225, 238-240, 255-258, 261-264, 325, and 326 are pending. Examiner refers to the rejection below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 165-167, 170, 174, 219-225, 325, and 326 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (U.S. patent 6,661,910 B2).

The applied reference has a common assignee and four inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the

Art Unit: 2623

reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claim 165: A system for processing documents, the system comprising:

at least one input receptacle that receives a stack of documents (fig. 1b elements 8a, col. 7 lines 16-22, and col. 9 lines 51-53, wherein the checks are fed, i.e. and input receptacle);

at least one output receptacle that receives the stack of documents (fig. 1b elements 8a, col. 7 lines 16-22, and col. 9 lines 51-53, wherein the system has two bins for the exit of the documents from the scanning device, i.e. it has at least one output receptacle);

an image scanning system that obtains an image of at least a portion of at least one side of each document in the stack and extracts, from the document image, an amount of information which uniquely identifies the document (fig. 1b elements 8a, col. 5 lines 35-40, col. 65 lines 13- 28, col. 7 lines 16-22, and col. 9 lines 51-53, wherein documents are enter the scanner and exit into pockets, i.e. each document is transported and scanned by the scanner and data that identifies each document is extracted from each document);

a transport mechanism that transports each of the documents in the stack, one at a time, from the at least one input receptacle, past the image scanning system, to the at least one output receptacle (fig. 1b elements 8a, col. 5 lines 35-40, col. 65 lines 13-28, col. 7 lines 16-22, and col. 9 lines 51-53, wherein documents are enter the scanner and exit into pockets, i.e. each document is transported and scanned by the scanner);

a memory that stores an amount of information which identifies at least one counterfeit document (col. 7 lines 1-10, col. 8 lines 53-67, col. 11 lines 29-40, and col. 15 lines 17-28); and

a processor operating to compare the extracted amount of information which uniquely identifies each document in the stack to the stored amount of information which identifies at least one counterfeit document, and to identify, as a suspect document, any document in the stack with matching information (col. 7 lines 1-10, col. 8 lines 53-67, col. 11 lines 29-40, and col. 15 lines 17-28).

Regarding claim 166: The system wherein the amount of information which uniquely identifies each document is a predetermined field of a document image, and wherein the amount of information which identifies a counterfeit document is a predetermined field of a counterfeit document image (col. 6 lines 13-28, wherein the serial number on the currency or check number/account number on a check are located in specific locations, i.e. predetermined fields, on the respective documents).

Regarding claim 167: The system wherein the amount of information which uniquely identifies each document is an encoded data field of a document image, and wherein the amount of information which identifies a counterfeit document is an encoded field of a counterfeit document image (col. 6 lines 13-28, wherein the seal of the document is obtained. The seal is read as the encoded data).

Regarding claim 170: The system wherein the image scanning system locates a field of the document image and extracts the amount of information from the field (col. 6 lines 13-28, wherein the serial number on the currency or check number/account number on a check are located in specific locations, i.e. predetermined fields, on the respective documents).

Regarding claim 173: The system wherein the transport mechanism transports the documents in a direction that is perpendicular to a longer edge of the document (col. 12 lines 25-27 and col. 15 lines 45-50).

Regarding claim 174: The system wherein the image scanning system obtains an image of at least a portion of each side of each document and extracts the amount of information which uniquely identifies the document from either document image (col. 5 lines 33-40 and col. 6 lines 13-28).

Regarding claims 219 and 220: See claim 165.

Regarding claim 221: The method further comprising rejecting any document identified as suspect (col. 8 lines 53-67, wherein the counterfeit documents are held/rejected).

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claim 222: The method of Claim 219, further comprising halting processing of the plurality of documents if any of the documents are identified as suspect documents (col. 8 lines 53-67, wherein the counterfeit documents are held/rejected).

Regarding claim 223: The method of Claim 219, further comprising alerting an operator if any of the documents are identified as suspect documents (col. 8 lines 53-67, wherein the counterfeit documents are held/rejected and the operator/customer notified).

Regarding claim 224: The method of Claim 219, further comprising indicating if any of the documents are identified as suspect documents (col. 8 lines 53-67).

Regarding claim 225: See claim 165.

Regarding claims 325 and 326: See claim 165.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 171 and 172 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (U.S. patent 6,661,910 B2).



Regarding claims 171 and 172: Jones et al. discloses a currency/check/document sorting and authentication system by extracting certain data from each document and using this data to authenticate the documents and to track and record the financial transaction taking place. Jones et al. does not teach to use optical character recognition (OCR) to locate a field in a document and/or locate the amount of information in the document. The method of Using OCR to locate character/alphanumeric regions in a document is well known and examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE. One in the art would have been motivated to include the method of OCR into the system to help recognize characters or other document information that may be blurry/unrecognizable by the user.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Oh (U.S. patent 2006/0054454 A1) for an apparatus which processes currency and extracts the denomination and serial numbers of bills.

### ***Contact Information***

6. Any inquiry into this communication should be directed to Anand Bhatnagar whose telephone number is 571-272-7416, whose supervisor is

Jingge Wu whose number is 571-272-7429, group receptionist is 703-305-4700,  
and Central fax is 571-273-8300.

***Contact Information***

7. Any inquiry into this communication should be directed to Anand  
Bhatnagar whose telephone number is 571-272-7416, whose supervisor is  
Jingge Wu whose number is 571-272-7429, group receptionist is 703-305-4700,  
and Central fax is 571-273-8300.

AB

Anand Bhatnagar

Technology Division 2624

June 12, 2006

JINGGE WU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER